

## REMARKS

In the Office Action dated May 26, 2005, the Examiner indicates Claims 2-5 and 8-12 are allowable, and Claims 7 and 13-16 are rejected.

Of the rejected claims, Claims 7, 13, and 14 are independent and rejected as unpatentable over Molne in view of Seppanen. The Examiner's position is that Molne teaches every element of the claims except that network selection data can be modified to include preferred networks from an operator list, but that Seppanen teaches in an analogous art that network selection data can be so modified.

Claim 14 has been amended so that now, Claims 7, 13, and 14 all require that the network selection data is modified so that networks from the operator list have preference over other user-defined or operator-defined networks.

Applicants have stated in their previous response that Molne describes a system in which a list of preferred mobile networks is stored on a SIM for use in network selection. However, Molne does not disclose that the list is used to modify PLMN data so that networks in the list have preference over user-defined and other networks, such as networks with higher signal strength. Molne also discloses that the list stored on the SIM can be modified by both the user and the operator (column 3, lines 53 to 55); therefore, Molne specifically teaches away from the use of a preferred list of networks that have preference over user-defined networks because the list in Molne is user definable.


Turning to Seppanen, Seppanen describes a system for accessing various "types" of networks, e.g., a residential, public or private network, and various service, e.g., fax, data, email, supported by those networks in accordance with user needs. Seppanen does not disclose that network selection data is modified to include preferred networks from an operator list. Network selection is described as being by manual selection by the user or automatic selection based on priorities that can be assigned to the networks. Like Molne, Seppanen specifically teaches away

from the user of a preferred list of networks that have preference over user-defined networks because network selection is based on user preference or needs.

Therefore, the combination of Molne and Seppanen does not meet the strict requirement of teaching very limitation of amended Claims 7, 13, and 14. Further, the rejected independent Claims 15 and 16 are also patentable over the cited art of Molne, Seppanen and Lee.

The Applicants submit that a combination of Molne and Lee does not meet the requirement of disclosing every limitation of the independent claims.

Respectfully submitted,  
JACKSON WALKER L.L.P.



Thomas E. Sisson  
Reg. No. 29,348  
112 E. Pecan Street, Suite 2100  
San Antonio, Texas 78205  
(210) 978-7700 (phone)  
(210) 978-7790 (fax)  
Attorneys for Applicant



CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited on the date shown below with the United States Postal Service, with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop: RESPONSE/FEE, Commissioner of Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

VIA FIRST CLASS MAIL

Date:

Shirley McIntyre